

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-54 are pending in the application. The Examiner additionally stated that claims 1-17 and 21-54 are rejected. By this amendment, claims 11, 18, 32, 35-36, 41 and 53 have been cancelled; claims 1, 12-14, 19, 25, 38, 40, 42, 44-45, 48 and 54 have been amended; and new claims 55-101 have been added. Hence, claims 1-10, 12-17, 19-31, 33-34, 37-40, 42-52 and 54-101 are pending in the application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the foregoing amendments.

NB: Applicant notes that reference EP0402787 A2 to Charles P. Ryan with a publication date of 12-19-1990 was submitted in a previous IDS and the Examiner initialed the other references included in the IDS but did not initial the Ryan reference. Applicant has submitted a new IDS on 5/19/2006 that includes the reference. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate that he has considered the reference along with the other references included in the new IDS.

In the Claims

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 36 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 54 to be directed toward statutory subject matter and has canceled claim 36.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 25, 32 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 14 and 25 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant notes that similar changes were added to corresponding new claims 67 and 77. Claims 32 and 35 have been canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 18-20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration and indications of allowability of these claims.

By this amendment, the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 18 have been incorporated into the language of claim 1. Claims 11 and 18 have been cancelled and those claims depending from claim 11 have been amended to now depend from claim 1, as appropriate.

By this amendment, limitations similar to the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 18 have been incorporated into the language of claim 38. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a microprocessor that updates early status flags by copying to them architected status flags when the microprocessor pipeline is flushed.

By this amendment, limitations similar to the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 18 have been incorporated into the language of claim 48. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest updating early status flags by copying to them architected status flags when the microprocessor pipeline is flushed.

By this amendment, limitations similar to the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 18 have been incorporated into the language of claim 54. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a computer program embodied on a computer-readable medium having computer readable program code for providing an apparatus in a microprocessor that updates early status flags by copying to them architected status flags when the microprocessor pipeline is flushed.

By this amendment, the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 19 have been incorporated into the language of new claim 55, which also recites the limitations of original claim 1. New claims 56-86 depend from new claim 55 and recite further limitations.

By this amendment, limitations similar to the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 19 have been incorporated into the language of new claim 87, which also recites the limitations of original claim 38. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a microprocessor that updates early status flags by copying to them architected status flags when no instructions in the pipeline between a first and second stage of the pipeline are instructions that require modification of the status flags. New claims 88-95 depend from new claim 87 and recite further limitations.

By this amendment, limitations similar to the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 19 have been incorporated into the language of new claim 96, which also recites the limitations of original claim 48. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest updating early status flags by copying to them architected status flags when no instructions in the pipeline between a first and second stage of the pipeline are instructions that require modification of the status flags. New claims 97-100 depend from new claim 96 and recite further limitations.

By this amendment, limitations similar to the allowable limitations of claims 11 and 19 have been incorporated into the language of new claim 101, which also recites the limitations of original claim 54. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a computer program embodied on a computer-readable medium having computer readable program code for providing an apparatus in a microprocessor that updates early status flags by copying to them architected status flags when no instructions in the pipeline between a first and second stage of the pipeline are instructions that require modification of the status flags.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the arguments advance above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10, 12-17, 19-31, 33-34, 37-40, 42-52 and 54-101 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested, and allowance of the claims is solicited.

Applicant earnestly requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions concerning this amendment, the application, or allowance of any claims thereof.

Respectfully submitted,

/E. Alan Davis/

By: _____

E. ALAN DAVIS
Registration No. 39,954
Tel: (512) 301-7234

6/6/2006

Date: _____